P.7. 209-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

*Previous references.*

1891-92

192 .

( L.R )

*Later references.*

File No. 192 -

Serial Nos.

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*Serial Nos.* 1-5

~~Part~~ B for November

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Sheik Ali Sab, Nasikar, Davanagere taluk, Claiming Rs 357. under the terms of Toll Contract of the Tunga Bhadra bridge.

To,

The Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug District.

No. 7282 dt. 26/29. 12. 1892.

P.7. 209-92

Stating that the appeal of the petitioner has been dismissed as he has no right to the Collections made between 1st and 15th April 1890. as the Muchalika Sirdar by him shows only that he purchased the right of Collection from 16th April 1890 to 31st March 1892.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Cust.

Dr. is informed that as the purchaser given by him shows that he purchased the right of collecting tolls from 16th April 1890 to 31st March 1892, he is not entitled to the collections made between 1st & 15th April 1890.

1

Dn No 2042 of 1891-92 (5)

Appl

Sheikalli

Sole contractor

Harbar

Devangere Taluq

Appl purchased the right of collecting tolls on the Harbar bridge for 2 years ending 31st March 1892. He states that he realized Rs 35 between 1st & 15th April 1890 & requests that the sum may be refunded to him.

The Municipality given by the appl shows that he purchased the right of Collection from 16th April 1890 to 31st March 1892 for 2 years". He has therefore no right to the collections made between 1st & 15th of April 1890. The appeal is dismissed.

18/4/92

2

Form No. 3.

# FACING SHEET FOR FILE.

.....Petition.....Branch,

File No. of 1892-93.

## SUBJECT.

In re the claim of Rupees 35.1-9 under the Benefield contract for Singa Khara Bridge.

Dead
619.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1891/92

No. 2042

Name of Petitioner. [illegible]

Village. [illegible]

Taluk. [illegible]

District. [illegible]

Date of Arzi. [illegible]

Date of Receipt. [illegible]

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One

ABSTRACT.

5.

91

Divisional Manager office received.
28-11-91

SECRETARIAT DEPARTMENT
RECEIPT 2042R
DATE 30-11-91

29-11-92

A.S.No 215
91-92

16

No. 2042- LR 192-91-5

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE, (6)
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
29 Novr 1892.

Endorsement granted to Sheik alli, Toll contractor, Harihar
in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2042 dated 28th Novr/91 Davangere Taluk.

---

Petitioner is informed that as the muchalika given by him shows that he purchased the right of collecting tolls from 16th April 1890 to 31st March/92 he is not entitled to the collections made before the 16th April 1890.

2 The enc: is returned.

28/11

26/11

Redraft

S.V.

"By Order,"

28/11/92

for Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.





R.
34

8

Encl received 30/5

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2042

dated 28th November/91 received at the Dewan's Office from Sheik Ali Sab Narayhar, Doddaballapur Taluk, claiming Rs 35/8/- under the terms of Toll contract of the Nuzabhad Bridge

is forwarded, together with its one enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner Chickballapur for a brief report.

2 Does the Sunchalika Patra of the village under which the toll was sold cover the period during which the collections were made in arrear? If it does, what is the ground on which, and on which the collections made during that period are refused to the petitioner Contractor?

3 The petition should be returned

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
30 May 1892

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE

1892. 2244.

P. 118

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of Mysore.

Dated 27th August 1892.

Despatched 24th [illegible]

Received

Enclosures No. 2 with a file
of Case Papers.

General No. 114.

No. 111.

In reply to Memo No. 2262-63 dated

SUBJECT.

Submitting a report with
Petition for Remission
of Fine imposed on
the Tehsildar of
Hiriyur

Petitioner.

Rev. [illegible]

Hiriyur

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

To the same No. 2282
dated 29th August 1892

Mr Bucknill has
do not think the
period during which
the Amount collected
is question was
made
Mysore Bucknill
Chief Secretary
for orders

Submitted to the Hon'ble
Councillor - The Petr must
be informed that he has
no right to the collections
from 1st to 15th April 1892.

16/8/92

Hon'ble Mr Nicholson
Hon'ble Mr Bowring
Hon'ble Mr Rangacharlu
Hon'ble Mr Seshadri Iyer
Hon'ble Mr Sheshagiri Iyer

16/10/92

Read 31/8

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chittagong District
Chittagong Hill Tracts.

No. T/11.
Encl: Tariff a like
of Cau: Rules.
Lo

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Eastern

Sir,

With reference to your official
Memorandum No. 5-1 dated 3rd the
May, 92, forwarding for report
a petition from Chiefs of Cachi
Kaik tribe complaining of Encroachment
Beside at Jhalong and requesting
that the Enclosed Cattle may
be allowed unto their Hills, such
and said cases the land Lying
which the petitioners have made
in Jhalong, and if they have not
is the ground in which the petitioners
made Jhum Cultivation and
reported to the Settlement Officer
I have the honor to submit here-
with the necessary enquiries
being made by Assistant
Deputy Commissioner Mr. Dalton
report as to Jhalong & Jhalong

and to state as follows: —

2. — That I am a solicitor
duly admitted and practising
as such, and I am the
plaintiff's solicitor in the
matter of the Petition of
Application dated the 22nd
day of August 1906 and
filed on the 23rd day of
August 1906, which
Petition is intituled
as above. In the
said Petition, and by the
Order made thereon
dated the 22nd day of
August 1906, the
Petitioner was appointed
Guardian of the
Infant Children
mentioned in the
Petition and in the
said Order. I am
informed by the
Petitioner and believe
that the Petitioner
has duly executed the
Guarantee. I crave the
indulgence of this
Honourable Court for the
above, and the Petitioner
will ever pray &c.

Sworn &c.

Solicitor.

from 1st to 5th April 1900.-
Dr. Clerk Cutts in the Suit
for that the contract should
have effect from the 1st April 1900
In this Suit order dated 2nd March
15th April 1900 that the Amount
of damages, viz. Rs 35-1-9 the
the Civil Surgeon, Meerut
that the amount collected from 1st
to 15th April 1900, should be remitted
to Government and that the Contractor
should be put in possession of the
"Ghat" from the 16th April 1900.-
The petitioner presented a petition
dated 9th June 1900 to the Amount
of damages, Rs 35-1-9
collected by Government from 1st to
15th April 1900, and in a letter
dated 6th July 1900 to the Amount
ordered, viz 200 dated 21st July 1900
was sent to the effect that as
the previous Contract has only
from the 1st April 1900 the had no
right to claim the money which
had been previously collected under
special orders of Government and duly
credited to Government.

3. – In that circumstance, the
Secretary has no reason for the
confidence to urge that the Contract
cannot be fulfilled & some
form of Settlement
to that effect by him in his official
position to Government.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient servant,

Thomas Ellis
Deputy Surveyor

Com

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 2042 of 1891-92.

| Appellant. | Vs. | Respondent. |
|---|---|---|
| Sheikalli, toll contractor, Haribar, Davangere Taluk. | | |

*Decision.* 20-11-92

Appellant purchased the right of collecting tolls on the Haribar bridge for 2 years ending 31st March 1892. He states that the Government realized Rs 35 between 1st and 15th April 1890 and requests that the sum may be refunded to him.

2. The munchalika given by the Appellant shows that he "purchased the right of collection from 16th April 1890 to 31st March 1892 for 2 years." He has therefore no right to the collections made between 1st and 15th April 1890. The appeal is dismissed.

By Order

Judicial Secretary, Govt

7282
Pol. F. 209-92 ad 26/29 11/92 187

Copy to the Deputy Comm. Christaldrug
Dist. with the 132 papers received with his
No 114/110 of 22d August/92.

By Order

Chief Secretary.

SF